

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, claims 1-13, 30-41, 45-46 and 50-52 were pending in the application. In the office action dated January 26, 2009 claims 1-13, 30-41, 45-46 and 50-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicants hereby address the office action's rejections in turn.

Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-13, 30-41, 45-46 and 50-52 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,534,974 ("*Hasegawa*"). Applicants address these rejections in order below and applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome these rejections and add no new matter.

Amended claim 1 recites a method of limiting access to a media tray that includes "defining a target pass code associated with a media tray by selecting the media tray and receiving the target pass code via a user interface at a control panel of a network device having the media tray" among other things. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification (See Specification, page 7, lines 21-22, and page 8, lines 7-9).

In contrast, *Hasegawa* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Hasegawa* discloses a panel unit notifying a user of a current status of a printer, and serving as an input terminal from which mode command is input. (See *Hasegawa*, col. 3, lines 52-54). *Hasegawa* further discloses a controller assigning an identification (ID) to each user so as to discriminate between a plurality of users. (See *Hasegawa*, col. 4, lines 21-22). This is patentably distinct from the claimed subject matter, which includes entering the target pass code

via a user interface at a control panel of a network device having the media tray. Indeed, *Hasegawa* describes a controller automatically assigning IDs to print jobs to route to correct media, and fails to describe the elements of amended claim 1.

Thus, *Hasegawa* fails to anticipate or suggest the claimed subject matter as recited by amended claim 1. Dependent claims 3-13 and 50-52 depend from claim 1 are, therefore allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent claim 1 and by virtue of their additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of independent claim 1 and dependent claims 3-13 and 50-52. Claim 2 has been canceled without any prejudice or disclaimer.

Amended claim 30 recites a storage device readable by a processor, tangibly embodying instructions executable by the processor with similar elements to method recited in amended claim 1 such as “define a target pass code associated with a media tray by receiving a selection of the media tray through entry of the target pass code via a user interface at a control panel of a network device having the media tray”. Amended claim 45 recites a method of limiting access to a media tray similar to the instructions of amended claim 30. Accordingly, independent claims 30 and 45 are distinguishable over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of claims 30 and 45.

Dependent claims 34-41 and 46 depend from claims 30 and 45, respectfully and are, therefore, allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent claims 30 and 45 and by virtue of their additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of dependent claims 34-41 and 46. Claims 31-33 have been cancelled without any prejudice or disclaimer.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and further examination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Date: February 26, 2009

22879

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Respectfully Submitted,

ADORNO & YOSS, LLC
1349 West Peachtree Street, N.E.
Suite 1500
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

(404) 347-8507
(404) 347-8505 (Direct)



Carl K. Turk
Reg. No. 59,675